THE SOCIAL PLANNING and RESEARCH COUNCIL of Hamilton and District

155 JAMES STREET SOUTH, 6TH FLOOR HAMILTON, ONTARIO L8P 3A4 TELEPHONE 522-1148

EMPLOYMENT CONSORTIUM EVALUATION

May 1992

Brian Bodo,
Research Assistant

Mike Pennock,
Executive Director

© THE SOCIAL PLANNING AND RESEARCH COUNCIL
OF HAMILTON AND DISTRICT

155 James Street South, Suite 601
Hamilton, Ontario. L8P 3A4

All rights reserved including the right to
reproduce in whole or in part of any form.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary i

1.0 Background 1

2.0 Purpose of the Evaluation 4

3.0 Methodology 5

OUTCOME EVALUATION

4.0 Client Responses 6
- 4.1 Introduction 6
- 4.2 Client Descriptors 6
- 4.3 Previous Employment 7
- 4.4 Current Employment 9
- 4.5 Job Satisfaction 10
- 4.6 Skill Development 11
- 4.7 Workplace Interactions 13
- 4.8 Problem Resolution 13
- 4.9 Conclusions 14

5.0 Employer Responses
- 5.1 Introduction 15
- 5.2 Involvement in the Consortium 15
- 5.3 Consortium Goals 16
- 5.4 Employer Attitudes 16
- 5.5 Attitudes Towards Client 16
- 5.6 Attitudes Towards Program 17
- 5.7 Conclusions 17

PROCESS EVALUATION

6.0 Employer Caucus 19
- 6.1 Caucus Goals 19
- 6.2 Caucus Process 19
- 6.3 Obstacles 20
- 6.4 Conclusions 20

7.0 Service Caucus 24
- 7.1 Caucus Goals 24
- 7.2 Caucus Process 24
- 7.3 Obstacles 25
- 7.4 Conclusions 25

8.0 Consumer Caucus 29
- 8.1 Caucus Goals 29
- 8.2 Caucus Process 29
- 8.3 Obstacles 30
- 8.4 Conclusions 30

9.0 Education Caucus 34
9.1 Caucus Goals 34
9.2 Caucus Process 34
9.3 Obstacles 35
9.4 Conclusions 35

10.0 Resource Caucus 38
10.1 Caucus Goals 38
10.2 Caucus Process 38
10.3 Obstacles 38
10.4 Conclusions 38

11.0 Labour Caucus 41

12.0 Steering Committee 42
12.1 Committee Goals 42
12.2 Committee Process 42
12.3 Obstacles 43
12.4 Conclusions 43

PORTABILITY
13.0 Portability 47

CONCLUSIONS
14.0 Conclusions 49

Appendix A - Questionnaires

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this project was to conduct an evaluation of the first two years of the Employment Consortium program in Hamilton-Wentworth. The Consortium is a multi-sector initiative to promote employment opportunities for persons with disabilities.

To provide a multi-sectoral perspectives on the issue of employment opportunities for persons with disabilities, the Consortium is composed of six caucuses which represent employers, service providers, resources, consumers, labour and education. The chairperson of each caucus form a Steering Committee which is responsible for the operation of the Consortium. The project is sponsored by the Industry-Education Council/Hamilton-Wentworth.

The evaluation of the first two years' activities included three components - outcome, process and portability. The outcome evaluation focused upon the degree to which the Consortium was successful in placing persons with disabilities in competitive employment settings. The process evaluation was related to the effectiveness of the Consortium developing and implementing the proposed caucus structure. The portability component focused on the identification of key considerations for other communities in developing similar initiatives.

In conducting the evaluation, face-to-face and telephone interviews of employers, clients and Steering Committee members were carried out. All participants in the caucuses completed a mailed questionnaire.

Outcome Evaluation

The project placed 32 clients in competitive employment during the first year of actual placements. Twenty-four agreed to be interviewed.

The clients were a heterogeneous group with respect to age, type of disability, education and previous employment experience. At the time of the survey, half of the clients were employed full-time and the remainder were working part-time. The majority were employed in clerical/secretarial positions. There was a high level of satisfaction reported with the employment experience.

A majority of the clients reported previous employment experience and it was therefore concluded, that the ability of the Consortium to facilitate the school-to-work transition of new labour force entrants had not been adequately tested during the first two years of operation.

The results suggested that the employment experience of the clients might involve some problems of social isolation and, in a few cases, unresolved conflicts with superiors.

Twenty employers were identified as providing employment opportunities and interviews were completed with sixteen. Employer responses to the program were very positive. They were unanimous in their reporting of satisfaction with the clients and the quality of their work. They were divided, however, in their views about the extent to which other employers in the community would share their positive perspective on the employment of persons with disabilities.

Process Evaluation

At the time of the study, the Consortium had been successful in recruiting 121 volunteers to the multi-sector caucus structure. The vast majority of these volunteers were satisfied with the experiences and were committed to the goals of the Consortium. A number of process issues were identified for attention during Year 3 of the project.

At the time of the study, there appeared to be problems related to co-ordination, information distribution and the development of a sense of identity within the Consortium as a "cohesive whole". Most of the individual caucuses were functioning effectively but there appeared to be problems of isolation - they had not yet merged as a co-ordinated body.

A number of the caucuses appeared to be hampered by a lack of support resources and an insufficient clarity in goals and role descriptions.

The degree to which some of the caucuses had been successful in providing support to employers was also identified as an issue and this was a source of dissatisfaction for some caucus members.

The importance of a strong unified consumer caucus which is able to mobilize extensive consumer input into the process was also emphasized.

Portability

Although it was difficult to draw firm conclusions related to portability after only two years of operation, a number of general themes were identified. To a considerable extent, the success of Year 2 operations appeared to have been facilitated by a number of factors.

The sponsorship of the project by the Industry-Education Council (IEC) and its ability to draw upon its extensive network in the community for the recruitment of key volunteers. The IEC was successful in recruiting a small core of very committed and effective volunteers at a very early stage and these volunteers, in turn, were able to draw upon their personal networks of colleagues. This process appeared to be an important factor in the Consortium's ability to recruit caucus volunteers and placement employers in a relatively short period of time.

The existence and participation of an experienced employment agency for persons with disabilities and their willingness to allocated skilled staff time to the Consortium also appeared to be a key factor in the ability of the Consortium to "move quickly" on its key objectives.

The results of the evaluation also suggested a number of issues which other communities should consider in the development of similar initiatives - the need for concise goals and terms of references for all caucuses; the need for a systematic inter-sector information and co-ordination strategy at a very early stage of the process; the need for the early development of a strong consumer caucus and the need for the early articulation and discussion of shared values and philosophies among the sectors that comprise the Consortium.

1.0 BACKGROUND

Between 1986 and 1989, the Industry-Education Council/Hamilton-Wentworth sponsored a project entitled "Operation Employability" to increase the exposure of disabled secondary school students to work settings through specialized co-operative education initiatives. This project was evaluated by the Social Planning and Research Council and the evaluation report raised concerns about the post-secondary school employability of the students who participated in the project. A recently completed follow-up study of the graduates from Operation Employability confirmed these concerns, the majority of graduates were employed in workshop settings after graduating from secondary school.

As a result of these concerns, the Industry-Education Council developed the Employment Consortium project in 1990 for the purpose of increasing employment opportunities for adults with disabilities in a non-workshop setting.

In early 1990, the Industry-Education Council (IEC) held a day long forum in collaboration with the Regional Advisory Committee on the Physically Disabled and the Co-ordinating Committee for the Developmentally Handicapped to explore the feasibility of the Employment Consortium concept. After the forum, a community development model appeared to be the most feasible approach.

The mandate of the Consortium would be to:

1) Recruit employers with positive hiring attitudes, to develop jobs to facilitate employment continuity for disabled persons;

2) Determine employment needs and trends in the community and current job requirements;

3) Develop strategies including long range planning, selection of trainees, and closer collaboration between employers, disabled persons and service providers to develop more effective supported work employment;

4) Provide assistance in the development of phone and train employment programs including internship opportunities utilizing support workers;

5) Provide knowledgeable advice and facilitation strategies designed to achieve increased placement and employment continuity of disabled persons;

6) Provide a community focus on public issues that are central to the employment of disabled persons, including independent living, transportation and supported work arrangements.

A second forum was held in May 1990, when service providers made a commitment to help develop and test a model that would help disabled persons find and maintain employment.

By the spring of 1991, the Consortium was beginning to take shape. For a year, the service providers had been meeting as a caucus and had developed a supported employment network with PATH Employment Services being responsible for the placement co-ordination of disabled job seekers.

The service providing agencies in Hamilton-Wentworth that provide assessments, counselling, training and placement services for people with disabilities were fully supportive of the Employment Consortium idea. PATH, who is one of these agencies, had the IEC fund one of their staff members to do the work of assessing, counselling and placing clients on behalf of the Consortium. PATH is well equipped for this endeavour for they have been placing disabled people in the workforce since 1973.

As early as 1990, the Industry-Education Council initiated consultations with the employment community to develop employment opportunities for disabled persons. In the spring of 1991, the "Goal 100" Project was launched by a group of small and medium sized employers with the intent of finding employment for 100 disabled workers in the span of one year as a part of the Consortium.

Since that time the community steering committee has grown to co-ordinate the efforts of six caucuses, employers, service providers, resources, consumers, labour and education.

The employer caucus established a goal of actively recruiting employers to provide employment opportunities for 100 persons with disabilities.

The service caucus was created for the purpose of enhancing employment co-ordination among existing providers and to assist the job seekers to gain and maintain employment.

The resource caucus is responsible for ensuring that adequate financial resources are available for the project.

The consumer caucus is representative of employed disabled persons who provide advice and feedback to the Consortium.

The labour caucus is working with union locals to increase employment opportunities for persons with disabilities.

The education caucus is working with the Consortium to improve the transition from school-to-work for the graduating students with disabilities.

The Employment Consortium has been funded along the way by the Ontario Office for Disability Issues, the Ministry of Skills Development, Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of Community and Social Services, Employment and Immigration Canada and the Hamilton Foundation.

The priority for 1992 is for the Employment Consortium to make the critical transition from pilot project to a community-based program.

2.0 PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluative design contained three primary components, each of which was structured to address specific questions and issues.

a) Process Evaluation

1) To identify the developmental process of the Consortium;
2) To clearly articulate the goals of the Consortium, committees and caucuses;
3) To identify the relative strengths and weaknesses of the developmental process and the current structure of the Consortium.

b) Outcome Evaluation

1) To identify the impact of the Consortium on the employment of persons with disabilities.

c) Portability Evaluation

1) To identify the key issues which other communities need to consider in the development of similar initiatives.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

To assess the effectiveness of the Employment Consortium program, from the perspective of all of the participants, the entire population of participants (n=168) were invited to participate in an interview and survey process.

A questionnaire was developed for each of the four groups of respondents: employers, clients, Steering Committee and Caucus Chairpersons and the Employment Consortium members. In total, 128 interviews or surveys were completed for a response rate of 76%.

Table 3.1 presents the number of completions and other relevant data for each participant category.

All telephone and personal interviews were completed by SPRC researchers.

The results were compiled and analyzed using the SPSS PC+ software package.

TABLE 3.1

Respondent Categories	Interviewer	Total Number of Potential Respondents	Number Responding	Response Rate	Method
1) Employers	Researcher	20	16	75.0%	Telephone
2) Clients	Researcher	32	24	75.0%	Personal/ Telephone
3) Steering Committee and Caucus Chairpersons	Researcher	15	14	93.0%	Personal
4) Employment Consortium Members		101	74	73.7%	Mail
Total/Average		168	128	76.0%	Telephone/Personal/ Mail

OUTCOME EVALUATION

4.0 CLIENT RESPONSES

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the results obtained from interviews of 24 clients. A total of 32 clients were approached for interviews and 75% agreed to participate. Fifteen were employed at the time of the interviews while 9 were casual placements working 1 or 2 days in total. For questionnaire, see Appendix A, page A-1.

4.2 Client Descriptors

The twenty-four respondents were not concentrated within any specific age group.

Age	#	%
20 - 35	3	12.5
26 - 30	4	16.6
31 - 35	4	16.6
36 - 40	4	16.6
41 - 45	2	8.3
46 - 50	4	16.6
51 - 65	2	8.3
N/A	1	4.1
	24	100%

Ten respondents (41.7%) were male and fourteen (58.3%) were female.

A variety of levels of education attainment were present among the respondents.

Level of Education	#	%
Below 9	3	12.5
9 - 12	7	29.2
College	6	25.0
University	6	25.0
Trades	2	8.3
	24	100%

A variety of disabilities were reported.

Disability	#	%
Schizophrenia	4	16.6
Back problems	4	16.6
Visual impairments	2	8.3
Arthritis	2	8.3
Fibrositis	2	8.3
Heart problems	1	4.1
Epilepsy	1	4.1
Taurette Syndrome	1	4.1
Muscular Dystrophy	1	4.1
Hearing impairment	1	4.1
Foot/leg problems	1	4.1
Wrist/elbow problems	1	4.1
Balance	1	4.1
Illiteracy	1	4.1
	23	

* Note: Responses less than 24 because one client did not answer.

4.3 Previous Employment

Only 6 (25%) of the clients reported that they had been involved in work placements while they were still in school.

Twenty-one of the clients (87.5%) did report previous employment experience in a variety of different positions.

Previous Employment	#	%
Secretarial/Clerical	9	37.5
Sales	3	12.5
Janitor/Cleaning	3	12.5
Cashier	2	8.3
Security Guard	2	8.3
Social Health Services	3	12.5
Minister	2	8.3
Factory/Assembly	2	8.3
Waitress	1	4.1
Laundry	1	4.1
Packing	1	4.1
Research	1	4.1
Baker	1	4.1
School Bus Driver	1	4.1
	32	

* Note: Responses greater than 24 because multiple responses.

Twenty-one (87.5%) of these positions had been in the private sector while eleven (45.8%) were in the public or non-profit sector. Thirteen (54.2%) of these positions had been held for less than a year. Ten (41.7%) had been held for one to three years and five (20.8%) were held for 3 to 10 years. Four (16.7%) respondents had held their previous positions for more than 10 years.

The majority of the respondents had only had one job prior to becoming involved in the Consortium (n=16, 66.7%). Six persons had experience in two jobs while two persons had experience in three.

The reasons for leaving their previous employment were varied, although issues related to their disability were mentioned with the greatest frequency.

Reasons for Leaving	#	%
Disability/illness	9	37.5
Quit	5	20.8
Contract completed	5	20.8
Laid off	3	12.5
Fired	3	12.5
Placement completed	3	12.5
Returned to school	2	8.3
	30	

* Note: Responses greater than 24 because multiple responses.

4.4 Current Employment

Sixteen (69.6%) of the clients reported that they had "found out" about their current job through PATH. Three indicated that they had learned about the position through the newspaper while four reported that a counsellor at their previous workplace had informed them about the position. Only 6 respondents (25.%) were familiar with the Employment Consortium.

Thirteen (54.2%) of the respondents were working on a full-time basis. Two were working four days per week, four were working two days per week and one was working one day per week.

The reported hours worked per day were as follows.

	Respondents	
Hours/Day	#	%
2 - 3	3	12.5
4 - 5	2	8.3
6 - 7	4	16.7
8	12	50.0
9	1	4.2
	24	100%

Rates of pay were varied.

Respondents reported a variety of job duties.

Duties	#	%
Telephone Reception	7	29.2
Word/Data Processing	3	12.5
Cleaning/Sweeping	3	12.5
Accounting	2	8.3
Stuffing Envelopes	2	8.3
Employment Counsellor	2	8.3
Sorting Mail/Filing	1	4.1
Inventory	1	4.1
Tape Recording	1	4.1
Teaching	1	4.1
Patrol Grounds	1	4.1
Paint Ceramics	1	4.1
Baking	1	4.1
Inspection	1	4.1
	27	

* Note: Responses greater than 24 because multiple responses.

Fourteen respondents (58.3%) reported that their job duties had not changed since starting in their present position. Nine (37.5%) indicated that their duties had changed. Of those who reported a change, ten indicated that the change had involved "more work" rather than a change in role.

4.5 Job Satisfaction

A large majority of respondents (87.5%, n=21) reported that they liked their current employment. The most frequent reasons for enjoying their jobs were as follows.

Reason	#	%
Enjoy helping people	5	20.8
Like fellow employees	5	20.8
Interesting/challenging	4	20.8
Little pressure	3	12.5
Pay	1	4.1
Happy to be working	1	4.1
Working on computer	1	4.1
Working out of home	1	4.1
	21	

Of the two respondents who indicated that they did not like their current job, only one provided a reason - dislike of co-workers.

Half of the respondents did not indicate that they would like to change anything about their current job. Of those who indicated a desire for change, the type of change desired was varied.

Changed Desired	#	%
Better education of employers, re: disabled persons	3	12.5
More hours of work	2	8.3
Better training program	2	8.3
Different boss	1	4.1
Better pay	1	4.1
	9	

4.6 Skill Development

Fifty percent of the respondents indicated that they had learned new skills since beginning their employment. The skills which were identified were varied.

Skills	#	%
Computers	3	12.5
Office work	1	4.1
Audio equipment	1	4.1
Floor cleaning machines	1	4.1
Teaching persons with disabilities	1	4.1
Communication skills	1	4.1
Baking skills	1	4.1
Film cutting	1	4.1
Ceramic	1	4.1
	11	

Among the twelve respondents (50%) who reported that they had not learned new skills, only 3 felt that they would learn new skills in the future.

The twelve respondents who reported that they had learned new skills were ask how they felt as a result of the new skill acquisition - seven indicated that the new skills caused them to feel more confident or to feel better about themselves while two reported that it made them feel more secure.

Respondents were also asked if there was anything that they had wanted to learn since starting their job. Seventeen (70.8%) responded to the positive. The most frequent responses were as follows.

New Learning Desired	#	%
Learn more about present job	8	33.3
Computers	7	29.2
Teaching	1	4.1
Writing/reading skills	1	4.1
	17	

One respondent indicated that they did not want to learn anything new on their current job because they wanted to change their career.

4.7 Workplace Interactions

Fourteen (58.3%) of respondents indicated that they talked with co-workers and twelve (50%) reported that they ate lunch/"took breaks" with co-workers or asked co-workers for help on the job. Only 8 respondents (33.3%) indicated that co-workers helped them with their jobs.

A large majority (91.7%, n=22) indicated that there was someone in the workplace from whom they could ask assistance if a problem developed. The largest number of respondents (13 or 54%) indicated that this person was the boss or manager, 6 indicated other staff and 3 mentioned PATH Employment Services.

4.8 Problem Resolution

Ten respondents (41.7%) reported that they had encountered problems on the job. The nature of these problems were varied.

Type of Problem	#	%
The boss	3	12.5
Other workers	2	8.3
Inadequate training	1	4.1
Too much work	1	4.1
Not knowing anyone	1	4.1
Marketing to clients	1	4.1
	9	

Of the ten clients who indicated that they had encountered problems, five reported that their problems had not been resolved. Of the remaining five respondents who had their problems resolved, four were satisfied with the resolution. In a majority of cases for which the problem was not resolved, it involved a conflict with the "boss".

When asked how they attempt to resolve problems when they are encountered, thirteen (54.2%) indicated that they talk to their supervisor. Three reported that they talk to other staff members and three indicated that they resolve them on their own.

4.9 Conclusions

1. A significant proportion of the clients were unaware of the role which had been planned by the Employment Consortium in facilitating their placement.

2. The clients were not concentrated in any particular age group or educational level. There was a relatively even gender representation although females outnumbered males by 14 to 10. The clients also represented a wide variety of disabilities.

3. A large majority of the clients reported previous employment experiences in a variety of settings within the private, public or non-profit settings. The length of time in previous employment ranged from less than a year to more than 10 years although the largest number had been employed for less than a year.

4. At the time of the survey, just over half of the respondents were working on a full-time basis. The remainder were working part-time. Two-thirds of the clients were employed in clerical/secretarial functions.

5. A large majority of the clients expressed satisfaction with their employment. Only two clients expressed dissatisfaction.

6. Half of the clients indicated that they had developed new skills, of a variety of types, since beginning their employment. For most of these respondents, the acquisition of these new skills had resulted in greater feelings of self-confidence.

7. There was some indication that problems of social isolation may exist with some of the clients. Only a slight majority indicated that they talked with their co-workers and just half of the clients reported that they ate lunch or took breaks with their co-workers. It was noteworthy, however, that relatively few of the clients identified social isolation as a concern.

8. Ten of the clients had encountered a variety of different problems on the job and only half of them indicated that the problems had been resolved. Given the number of "unresolved problems" which occurred in the workplace, the Consortium might want to consider the development of a mediation or support service which can assist in the resolution of problems as they occur, if they have not been resolved through traditional workplace channels.

5.0 EMPLOYER RESPONSES

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the results obtained from telephone interviews of 16 employers. Four of the twenty employers who hired persons with disabilities through the Consortium were not available for interviews. For questionnaire, see Appendix A, page A-7.

5.2 Involvement in the Consortium

A majority of the employers became acquainted with the Consortium through fellow employers who were members of the Employers' Caucus or through PATH Employment Services.

Source of First Contact	#	%
Member of Consortium	7	43.7
PATH	4	25.0
Consortium staff	2	12.5
Newspaper	1	6.2
Student	1	6.2
	15	100%

Twelve of the respondents (75%) indicated that the first contact with Consortium was "in person" as opposed to telephone contact (25%).

Eleven (68.8%) reported that they were satisfied with this process, primarily because it was efficient (n=6) or simply because the Consortium did a "good job" (n=4).

Two indicated that they were not satisfied with the process, for unspecified reasons, and three did not respond.

The largest number of respondents (n=9) reported that they had become involved in the Consortium because they were proactive in issues related to the employment of disabled persons. Two indicated that the initiative was low cost and two indicated that they had experienced success in employing other persons with disabilities.

5.3 Consortium Goals

A majority of respondents (n=9, 56.3%) reported that the most important goal of the Consortium was the development of employment opportunities for disabled persons. A small number (n=5) indicated that the promotion of awareness about disabled persons was the most important goal.

Eighty-seven percent (n=14) reported that the Consortium goals were realistic while 2 respondents did not reply to this question.

5.4 Employer Attitudes

The respondents were split about the issue of whether or not local employers "are ready to hire physically/mentally handicapped" persons. Seven believed that they were ready while nine felt that they were not. Of the seven who responded to the affirmative, 4 indicated that this was because there was an increased understanding of the capabilities of persons with disabilities.

5.5 Attitudes Towards Client

Respondents were asked to describe the job duties required of the clients. The largest number of duties were office or clerical related in nature.

Duty	#	% of Clients
Data Entry	8	50.0
Typing	7	43.8
Switchboard	8	50.0
Filing	6	37.5
Accounting	2	12.5
Sweeping/Cleaning	3	18.8
Interviewing	1	6.3
Patrolling Grounds	1	6.3
	36	

* Note: Responses greater than 15 because multiple responses.

All of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the clients' progress since becoming employed. In response to queries about why they were satisfied, all of the respondents indicated that the clients were excellent and efficient workers.

Eleven (68.8%) of the respondents indicated that they had observed changes in the client since commencing employment. These changes were described as increased confidence/self-esteem (n=8) and a more outgoing approach by the client (n=2).

5.6 Attitudes Towards Program

All of the respondents indicated that they would recommend this program to other employers. The primary reasons for the positive recommendation were:

Excellent service (5)

Quality of disabled workers (6)

Desire to help disabled persons (2)

When asked if they would recommend any changes to the program, seven (43.8%) did not recommend any changes. Four believed that more advertising should be taken and three reported that the program needed more staff resources. Other suggestions were as follows:

- educate unions about persons with disabilities
- change name of program
- more cooperation among caucuses
- eliminate negative attitudes of some Consortium members
- find more jobs

5.7 Conclusions

There was strong support among the 16 respondents for the goals and process of the Employment Consortium. In its initial phase, the Consortium appears to have attracted a core group of employers who perceive themselves to be "proactive" in support of employment opportunities for persons with disabilities and generally, possess positive attitudes towards the employability of disabled persons.

They were divided, however, in their views about the extent to which other employers in the community shared their perspective on the issue.

Their positive views on the employability of persons with disabilities were reinforced by their experience with the Consortium clients. The respondents were unanimous in their satisfaction with the clients and in their perceptions that the clients were excellent and efficient workers in the tasks to which they had been assigned.

The tasks or job duties were varied in nature although the majority involved office/clerical work.

PROCESS EVALUATION

6.0 EMPLOYER CAUCUS

Fifty-one questionnaires were distributed to the members of the employer caucus and 24 were returned for a response rate of 47.0%. For questionnaire, see Appendix A, page A-12 and A-19.

6.1 Caucus Goals (Table 6.1)

The highest success ratings were attributed to the goals pertaining to the "support of a partnership of business and disabled persons" (79.2%), and the provision of jobs to disabled persons (58.3%). With respect to the latter goal, a notable proportion (16.7%) felt that the caucus had not been successful and 12.5% reported that it was "too early to tell".

Success ratings related to most of the other goals were lower, most frequently because a sizable proportion of respondents were either uncertain or believed it was too early to tell.

The goal with the largest proportion of respondents indicating a lack of success (25.0%) was - to seek out opportunities that can lead to non-traditional job opportunities. Only 29.2% rated the caucus as successful on this dimension.

6.2 Caucus Process (Table 6.2)

On the "participation" dimension, the majority of respondents responded positively to all of the items except the question pertaining to the importance of their own contribution to the committee (50% were uncertain).

The majority of respondents recorded positive responses on the items related to caucus focus although a notable proportion were uncertain about the extent to which the caucus focused on its mandate (29.2%) and the extent to which the committee had well defined goals (20.8%).

The majority of responses pertaining to caucus decision-making were positive although 20.8% were uncertain about the extent to which the caucus members worked well together.

Some problems were apparent in the responses concerning resources. Almost 42% reported that committee material should be distributed further in advance and 54% wished they had better information before

making decisions. There was also a high "uncertain" response (45.8%) to the item pertaining to a lack of staff resources.

The responses to the two items pertaining to co-ordinations indicated a high degree of uncertainty (41.7%) about the extent to which caucus activities were co-ordinated with other Consortium activities. This degree of uncertainty was probably due to the fact that 45.8% reported that they were not well informed about overall Consortium activities.

The responses pertaining to satisfaction were generally positive. The vast majority (91.7%) believed the caucus was dealing with important issues and almost 80% enjoyed their participation and believed that the caucus was making an important contribution.

6.3 Obstacles (Table 6.3)

There was a fairly high non-response rate to the items pertaining to obstacles to caucus performance, ranging from 20.8% to 37.5%.

None of the items were identified as a serious obstacle by a majority of the respondents, although the largest proportion (20.8%) identified "a lack of clarity about the role of the committee" as an obstacle and 16.7% identified "the quality of the support the committee receives from the Employment Consortium".

6.4 Conclusions

The relatively high rate of "uncertain" and "no response" to a number of the items was notable. This type of response pattern suggests that a number of the caucus did not feel suitably informed to make a judgment about goal attainment, caucus process or obstacles. This, in turn, could be the result of a lack of information or a lack of participation by some caucus members.

The former factor, lack of information, did appear to be of some importance. A majority of the respondents indicated a desire to have more information before making recommendations and a sizable proportion felt uninformed about overall Consortium activities. This lack of information, in turn, was probably related to the relatively high degree of uncertainty about the extent to which the caucus activities were co-ordinated with other Consortium activities.

Despite these issues, the responses indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the respondents personal involvement and the importance of the caucus activities. It was notable, however, that only a minority of respondents (33.3%) believed that they were making an important contribution to the caucus. This could be a "warning" related to future levels of commitment. Although the respondents felt positive about the project, their participation could be affected by limited feelings of personal contribution.

TABLE 6.1: EMPLOYER CAUCUS GOALS

	Successful %	Uncertain %	Not Successful %	Too Early To Tell %	No Answer %
A. To ensure that jobs are available to job seekers with disabilities.	58.3	12.5	16.7	12.5	-
B. To establish a "one-stop" service centre to serve as a conduit for employers, job seekers and service providers.	37.5	20.8	12.5	29.2	-
C. To facilitate new ventures for self employment	16.7	54.2	8.3	20.8	-
D. To support a partnership of business and disabled persons which provides advice/consultation to employer and disabled employees.	79.2	4.2	-	16.7	-
E. To increase training opportunities for persons with disabilities.	37.5	33.3	12.5	12.5	4.2
F. To seek out opportunities that can lead to non-traditional job opportunities.	29.2	29.2	25.0	12.5	4.2

TABLE 6.2: EMPLOYER CAUCUS PROCESS VARIABLES

Item	Agree %	Uncertain %	Disagree %	No Answer %
PARTICIPATION				
4. We have many good debates and discussions on this committee.	54.2	33.3	-	12.5
13. I feel quite comfortable in "speaking my mind" at committee meetings.	79.2	8.3	-	12.5
14. I believe that my comments are respected by other members.	79.2	8.3	-	12.5
15. I believe that I make an important contribution to this committee.	33.3	50.0	4.2	12.5
FOCUS				
2. This committee has a hard time focusing on the issues.	16.7	16.7	58.3	8.3
3. We spend too much time discussing things that have nothing to do with the agenda.	12.5	-	75.0	12.5
16. We tend to deal with a lot of issues which are outside of our mandate.	8.3	29.2	50.0	12.5
21. This committee has a well-defined set of goals to guide its activities.	58.3	20.8	8.3	12.5
DECISION-MAKING				
6. This committee seems to have a hard time making decisions.	4.2	12.5	70.8	12.5
8. Committee members represent a variety of philosophical perspectives.	70.8	8.3	12.5	8.3
9. The members of this committee work well together.	70.8	20.8	-	8.3
RESOURCES				
5. Among the committee members, we have most of the skills required to do the job.	70.8	12.5	8.3	8.3
10. Committee material should be distributed further in advance to allow me more time to familiarize myself with it.	41.7	20.8	29.2	8.3
11. At committee meetings, we often run out of time and have to hurry through some agenda items.	8.3	20.8	54.2	16.7
12. I quite often find myself wishing that I had better information upon which to base my decisions at committee meetings.	54.2	8.3	20.8	16.7
18. A lack of staff resources severely limits the effectiveness of this committee.	16.7	45.8	25.0	12.5

TABLE 6.2 (cont'd)

Item	Agree %	Uncertain %	Disagree %	No Answer %
CO-ORDINATION				
19. The activities of this committee are well co-ordinated with other Employment Consortium activities.	37.5	41.7	8.3	12.5
20. I am well informed about overall Employment Consortium activities.	41.7	4.2	45.8	8.3
SATISFACTION				
1. This committee is dealing with important issues.	91.7	-	-	8.3
7. I usually enjoy the time I spend on this committee.	79.2	8.3	-	12.5
17. I believe that this committee makes an important contribution to the Employment Consortium.	79.2	8.3	-	12.5

TABLE 6.3: EMPLOYER CAUCUS OBSTACLES

Item	% Rating Obstacle Severity as 1 or 2*	No Answer %
1. The degree of organization at committee meetings.	-	25.0
2. The level of participation by committee members.	4.2	20.8
3. Domination of committee meetings by one or two members.	16.7	20.8
4. Philosophical differences among the members.	-	20.8
5. A lack of clarity about the role that this committee is expected to play within the Employment Consortium.	20.8	25.0
6. The ability of the committee to arrive at a consensus about important issues.	4.2	25.0
7. The willingness of the Board to act upon committee recommendations.	4.2	37.5
8. The amount of support that the committee receives from the Employment Consortium.	8.3	29.2
9. The quality of the support that the committee receives from the Employment Consortium.	16.7	29.2

* 5 point scale

7.0 SERVICE CAUCUS

Twenty-three questionnaires were distributed to members of the service caucus and 18 were returned for a response rate of 78.3%. For questionnaire, see Appendix A, page A-13 and A-19.

7.1 Caucus Goals (Table 7.1)

A majority of respondents (72.2%) believed the caucus had been successful in providing a liaison between service agencies and the Consortium. Only a minority (44.4%), however, felt that they had been successful in meeting the needs of the Consortium and employers in terms of employment supports and potential employees. A total of 27.8% felt that the caucus had not been successful on this dimension.

The relatively low success rating pertaining to developing a hotline for consumers (27.8%) was due to a relatively high level of uncertainty (27.8%) and non-responses (22.2%).

7.2 Caucus Process (Table 7.2)

There was a relatively high rate of non-responses to many of the committee process items ranging from 22.2% to 33.3%. This suggests that a significant number of respondents did not feel sufficiently well-informed about the operation of the caucus to pass judgment about the caucus process.

With respect to participation, a large majority of those who did respond were positive in their evaluations. The same trend emerged with respect to the caucus focus items although two of the items had a sizable proportion of "uncertain" responses. Almost 28% were uncertain about the extent to which the caucus focused upon its mandate and 22% were uncertain about caucus goals. When combined with the non-responses, approximately half of the respondents did not pass judgment on these two items.

A majority of the respondents who replied to the decision-making items, responded in a positive direction. Opinions were more divided, however, about the resource items. Almost 17% wished that committee material could be distributed in advance and 33.3% were "uncertain" about whether the information provided was adequate for decision-making. Fifty percent felt that a lack of staff resources was severely limiting the effectiveness of the committee.

With respect to the co-ordination items, a majority of the respondents recorded either an "uncertain" rating or did not respond. Only 38.9% agreed that the caucus activities were well co-ordinated with other Consortium activities. Seventeen percent indicated that they were not well informed about Consortium activities while 44.4% felt adequately informed.

Among those who responded to the satisfaction items, a majority of responses were positive in nature.

7.3 Obstacles (Table 7.3)

The analysis of obstacles was hampered by a relatively high non-response rate which ranged from 27.8% to 33.3%.

Of those who did respond, almost 28% indicated that a lack of clarity about the role that the caucus is expected to play in the Consortium was an obstacle. Almost 17% indicated that a lack of participation by caucus members and the amount of support provided by the Employment Consortium was an obstacle.

7.4 Conclusions

The overall profile of the responses was indicative of a group which is characterized by a relatively low level of participation by a significant proportion of members. The relatively high level of non-respondents suggested that only seventy to eighty percent of this caucus was sufficiently involved to have a judgment about the program.

A lack of staff resources appeared to be a major issue to this caucus and it was notable that almost 28% of the group did not feel that the caucus was effective in meeting the needs of employers.

Given the "pioneering" nature of the Consortium in bringing together service providers and employers, the problems described above are of great importance. A visual review of the completed survey forms suggested that almost 30% of this caucus is sufficiently frustrated with the lack of ability of the caucus to meet the needs of employers that they have limited their participation in caucus activities.

This is clearly an issue which needs to be resolved.

TABLE 7.1 SERVICE CAUCUS GOALS

	Successful %	Uncertain %	Not Successful %	Too Early To Tell %	No Answer %
A. To provide a liaison between service agencies and the Consortium.	72.2	11.1	11.1	-	5.6
B. To ensure agencies are meeting the needs of Consortium and employers in terms of employment supports and potential employees.	44.4	11.1	27.8	11.1	5.6
C. To develop the Hotline as a source of information to consumers.	27.8	27.8	11.1	11.1	22.2

TABLE 7.2: SERVICE CAUCUS PROCESS VARIABLES

Item	Agree %	Uncertain %	Disagree %	No Answer %
PARTICIPATION				
4. We have many good debates and discussions on this committee.	66.7	5.6	-	27.8
13. I feel quite comfortable in "speaking my mind" at committee meetings.	66.7	-	5.6	27.8
14. I believe that my comments are respected by other members.	61.1	5.6	5.6	27.8
15. I believe that I make an important contribution to this committee.	50.0	16.7	-	33.3
FOCUS				
2. This committee has a hard time focusing on the issues.	16.7	5.6	55.6	22.2
3. We spend too much time discussing things that have nothing to do with the agenda.	5.6	11.1	55.6	27.8
16. We tend to deal with a lot of issues which are outside of our mandate.	-	27.8	44.4	27.8
21. This committee has a well-defined set of goals to guide its activities.	44.4	22.2	5.6	27.8

TABLE 7.2 (cont'd)

Item	Agree %	Uncertain %	Disagree %	No Answer %
DECISION-MAKING				
6. This committee seems to have a hard time making decisions.	11.1	16.7	44.4	27.8
8. Committee members represent a variety of philosophical perspectives.	55.6	11.1	5.6	27.8
9. The members of this committee work well together.	55.6	11.1	5.6	27.8
RESOURCES				
5. Among the committee members, we have most of the skills required to do the job.	55.6	11.1	5.6	27.8
10. Committee material should be distributed further in advance to allow me more time to familiarize myself with it.	44.4	11.1	16.7	27.8
11. At committee meetings, we often run out of time and have to hurry through some agenda items.	61.1	5.6	5.6	27.8
12. I quite often find myself wishing that I had better information upon which to base my decisions at committee meetings.	11.1	33.3	27.8	27.8
18. A lack of staff resources severely limits the effectiveness of this committee.	50.0	11.1	11.1	27.8
CO-ORDINATION				
19. The activities of this committee are well co-ordinated with other Employment Consortium activities.	38.9	27.8	5.6	27.8
20. I am well informed about overall Employment Consortium activities.	44.4	11.1	16.7	27.8
SATISFACTION				
1. This committee is dealing with important issues.	72.2	-	5.6	22.2
7. I usually enjoy the time I spend on this committee.	50.0	11.1	11.1	27.8
17. I believe that this committee makes an important contribution to the Employment Consortium.	61.1	5.6	5.6	27.8

TABLE 7.3: SERVICE CAUCUS OBSTACLES

Item	% Rating Obstacle Severity as 1 or 2*	No Answer %
1. The degree of organization at committee meetings.	5.6	27.8
2. The level of participation by committee members.	16.7	27.8
3. Domination of committee meetings by one or two members.	11.1	27.8
4. Philosophical differences among the members.	11.1	27.8
5. A lack of clarity about the role that this committee is expected to play within the Employment Consortium.	27.8	27.8
6. The ability of the committee to arrive at a consensus about important issues.	-	27.8
7. The willingness of the Board to act upon committee recommendations.	16.7	33.3
8. The amount of support that the committee receives from the Employment Consortium.	11.1	33.3
9. The quality of the support that the committee receives from the Employment Consortium.	5.6	33.3

* 5 point scale

8.0 CONSUMER CAUCUS

Eight questionnaires were distributed to members of the consumer caucus and 5 were returned for a response rate of 62.5%. For questionnaire, see Appendix A, page A-14 and A-19.

8.1 Caucus Goals (Table 8.1)

High levels of "uncertain" and "too early to tell" responses limited the analysis of these responses. The only goal statement which was rated by all of the respondents was the goal pertaining to the seeking of input from the disabled community. Only 2 respondents recorded a successful rating for this item while 3 recorded a "not successful" judgment.

8.2 Process (Table 8.2)

One respondent did not answer any of the questions pertaining to caucus process.

Among the remaining respondents, the responses to the participation items were generally positive although 1 person indicated that they did not feel that their comments were respected by others and two were uncertain about the extent of their own contribution.

Opinions pertaining to the focus items were divided. The group was split about whether the caucus had a hard time focusing on issues and whether it had a well defined set of goals although two of the respondents were uncertain about the latter dimension. Only one respondent indicated that the caucus spent too much time dealing with non agenda items and none of the group felt that they spent too much time dealing with issues which were not part of their mandate.

Opinions were also divided on the decision-making items although all 4 respondents believed that the caucus represented a variety of philosophical perspectives.

With respect to resources, 3 of the 4 respondents reported that they often "ran out of time" at meetings and that they desired better information for decision-making. The group was divided about the adequacy of staff resources.

Co-ordination appeared to be a problem. Only one respondent felt that their activities were well co-ordinated with the Consortium and two were uncertain. Two felt well informed about Consortium activities while two did not.

In responding to the satisfaction item, all four believed that the committee was dealing with important issues and three reported that they enjoyed their time on the caucus. Two believed that the caucus was making an important contribution to the Consortium while two did not.

8.3 Obstacles (Table 8.3)

Three of the respondents indicated that the level of participation by caucus members was an obstacle. Two reported that a lack of role clarification and inadequate support from the Consortium were obstacles. The only item which was not identified as an obstacle was "philosophical differences among the members".

8.4 Conclusions

The consumer caucus was one of the most recently created caucuses within the Consortium structure. As a result, it is difficult to draw conclusions about goal attainment from the responses, given the relatively high rates of combined "uncertain" and "too early to tell" responses. It was notable, however, that three of the five respondents appeared dissatisfied with the extent to which they had sought "input from the disabled community".

The relatively high rate of divided responses on the process questions may be a result of the recent creation of this caucus or it may be indicative of important divisions in expectations among the participants which could hamper the future evolution of this group.

A number of members appeared to feel relatively isolated from the Consortium and concerned about a lack of support. This may also be a function of the fact that the caucus is relatively new to the Consortium.

The problem of participation levels by members could serve as a serious obstacle to the resolution of the issues identified above. The causes of the participation problem were not obvious from the responses but it did not appear to be due to a lack of commitment to the work of the caucus or the Consortium.

In general, it appears that this caucus has not yet developed the sense of group cohesion which could be an important determinant of its future success. This may be a function of its recent development or symptomatic of important divisions between members which need to be addressed.

TABLE 8.1 CONSUMER CAUCUS GOALS

	Successful %	Uncertain %	Not Successful %	Too Early To Tell %	No Answer %
A. Market Consortium to consumers.	20.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	-
B. Act as an information resource to Consortium.	40.0	-	20.0	40.0	-
C. Direct job seekers to the appropriate place or caucus.	20.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	-
D. Monitor placements in consultation with other caucuses.	20.0	-	40.0	40.0	-
E. Act as an arbiter for consumer complaints.	20.0	-	40.0	40.0	-
F. Actively seek input from the disabled community.	40.0	-	60.0	-	-

TABLE 8.2: CONSUMER CAUCUS PROCESS VARIABLES

Item	Agree %	Uncertain %	Disagree %	No Answer %
PARTICIPATION				
4. We have many good debates and discussions on this committee.	60.0	20.0	-	20.0
13. I feel quite comfortable in "speaking my mind" at committee meetings.	80.0	-	-	20.0
14. I believe that my comments are respected by other members.	60.0	-	20.0	20.0
15. I believe that I make an important contribution to this committee.	40.0	40.0	-	20.0
FOCUS				
2. This committee has a hard time focusing on the issues.	40.0	-	40.0	20.0
3. We spend too much time discussing things that have nothing to do with the agenda.	20.0	-	60.0	20.0
16. We tend to deal with a lot of issues which are outside of our mandate.	-	-	80.0	20.0
21. This committee has a well-defined set of goals to guide its activities.	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0

TABLE 8.2 (cont'd)

Item	Agree %	Uncertain %	Disagree %	No Answer %
DECISION-MAKING				
6. This committee seems to have a hard time making decisions.	40.0	-	40.0	20.0
8. Committee members represent a variety of philosophical perspectives.	80.0	-	-	20.0
9. The members of this committee work well together.	40.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
RESOURCES				
5. Among the committee members, we have most of the skills required to do the job.	60.0	-	20.0	20.0
10. Committee material should be distributed further in advance to allow me more time to familiarize myself with it.	40.0	-	40.0	20.0
11. At committee meetings, we often run out of time and have to hurry through some agenda items.	60.0	-	20.0	20.0
12. I quite often find myself wishing that I had better information upon which to base my decisions at committee meetings.	60.0	-	20.0	20.0
18. A lack of staff resources severely limits the effectiveness of this committee.	40.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
CO-ORDINATION				
19. The activities of this committee are well co-ordinated with other Employment Consortium activities.	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0
20. I am well informed about overall Employment Consortium activities.	40.0	-	40.0	20.0
SATISFACTION				
1. This committee is dealing with important issues.	80.0	-	-	20.0
7. I usually enjoy the time I spend on this committee.	60.0	20.0	-	20.0
17. I believe that this committee makes an important contribution to the Employment Consortium.	40.0	40.0	-	20.0

TABLE 8.3: CONSUMER CAUCUS OBSTACLES

Item	% Rating Obstacle Severity as 1 or 2*	No Answer %
1. The degree of organization at committee meetings.	20.0	20.0
2. The level of participation by committee members.	60.0	20.0
3. Domination of committee meetings by one or two members.	20.0	20.0
4. Philosophical differences among the members.	-	20.0
5. A lack of clarity about the role that this committee is expected to play within the Employment Consortium.	40.0	20.0
6. The ability of the committee to arrive at a consensus about important issues.	20.0	20.0
7. The willingness of the Board to act upon committee recommendations.	20.0	40.0
8. The amount of support that the committee receives from the Employment Consortium.	40.0	40.0
9. The quality of the support that the committee receives from the Employment Consortium.	40.0	20.0

* 5 point scale

9.0 EDUCATION CAUCUS

The education caucus contained only four members and, consequently, percentages were not calculated. Raw numbers are used in all of the tables included in this section. For questionnaire, see Appendix A, page A-15 and A-19.

9.1 Caucus Goals (Table 9.1)

Two respondents believed that the caucus had been successful in improving the transition from school to work for disabled persons. One respondent was uncertain and one felt that the caucus had not been successful.

Two respondents reported that the caucus had not been successful in ensuring that appropriate training resources were available for employers and employees.

9.2 Caucus Process (Table 9.2)

A majority responded positively to the items pertaining to participation although one member did not believe that the caucus had good debates and discussions.

Opinions were divided about the items pertaining to caucus focus and decision-making although all four respondents agreed that the members worked well together.

With respect to resources, 3 members were satisfied with caucus agendas and the availability of information and the variety of skills available. None of the respondents reported dissatisfaction due to a lack of staff resources although two were uncertain about this issue.

In responding to the co-ordination items, none of the respondents agreed that their caucus activities were well co-ordinated with other Consortium activities. Two responded negatively to this item and two were uncertain.

With respect to the satisfaction items, all of the respondents indicated that they usually enjoyed their time on the caucus and three felt that the caucus was dealing with important issues. Only 2 felt that the caucus was making an important contribution to the Consortium and 2 were uncertain.

9.3 Obstacles

Eight of the items pertaining to obstacles were unanswered by two of the respondents and one item was unanswered by three respondents. As a result, no analysis was carried out on these items.

9.4 Conclusion

The major issues facing this caucus appear to be related to goals, a perceived lack of contribution to employers/employees and a perception of being isolated from the Consortium with respect to co-ordination and information.

TABLE 9.1: EDUCATION CAUCUS GOALS

	Successful #	Uncertain #	Not Successful #	Too Early To Tell #	No Answer #
A. To ensure that appropriate and effective training resources for the employers and employees are designed and implemented in conjunction with the needs and goals of Consortium.	1	-	2	-	1
B. Working to improve the transition from school to work for the disabled people.	2	1	1	-	-

TABLE 9.2: EDUCATION CAUCUS PROCESS VARIABLES

Item	Agree #	Uncertain #	Disagree #	No Answer #
PARTICIPATION				
4. We have many good debates and discussions on this committee.	2	1	1	-
13. I feel quite comfortable in "speaking my mind" at committee meetings.	4	-	-	-
14. I believe that my comments are respected by other members.	3	1	-	-
15. I believe that I make an important contribution to this committee.	3	1	-	-
FOCUS				
2. This committee has a hard time focusing on the issues.	2	-	2	-
3. We spend too much time discussing things that have nothing to do with the agenda.	1	1	2	-
16. We tend to deal with a lot of issues which are outside of our mandate.	1	-	3	-
21. This committee has a well-defined set of goals to guide its activities.	1	1	2	-
DECISION-MAKING				
6. This committee seems to have a hard time making decisions.	1	-	3	-
8. Committee members represent a variety of philosophical perspectives.	2	1	1	-
9. The members of this committee work well together.	4	-	-	-
RESOURCES				
5. Among the committee members, we have most of the skills required to do the job.	3	1	-	-
10. Committee material should be distributed further in advance to allow me more time to familiarize myself with it.	2	2	-	-
11. At committee meetings, we often run out of time and have to hurry through some agenda items.	1	-	3	-
12. I quite often find myself wishing that I had better information upon which to base my decisions at committee meetings.	1	-	3	-
18. A lack of staff resources severely limits the effectiveness of this committee.	-	2	2	-

TABLE 9.2 (cont'd)

Item	Agree #	Uncertain #	Disagree #	No Answer #
CO-ORDINATION				
19. The activities of this committee are well co-ordinated with other Employment Consortium activities.	-	2	2	-
20. I am well informed about overall Employment Consortium activities.	1	1	2	-
SATISFACTION				
1. This committee is dealing with important issues.	3	1	-	-
7. I usually enjoy the time I spend on this committee.	4	-	-	-
17. I believe that this committee makes an important contribution to the Employment Consortium.	2	2	-	-

10.0 RESOURCE CAUCUS

Twelve questionnaires were distributed to members of the resource caucus and seven were returned for a response rate of 58.3%. For questionnaire, see Appendix A, page A-16 and A-19.

10.1 Caucus Goals

The only goal identified for this caucus was as follows - to provide access to and awareness of advice from all levels of government and the community to ensure the continuity and quality of the program. Five of the respondents felt that they had been successful in accomplishing this goal while one reported that they had not been successful. One respondent was undecided.

10.2 Caucus Process (Table 10.1)

Three of the respondents did not reply to the process items and this limited the nature of the analysis.

In general, the responses were positive in nature with the following exceptions:

- 3 respondents expressed a desire for better information for decision-making;
- 3 were uncertain about the extent of co-ordination with other Consortium activities;
- only 2 felt well-informed about Consortium activities.

10.3 Obstacles (Table 10.2)

Four of the respondents did not respond to the items pertaining to obstacles. Two respondents identified a lack of role clarity and an inability to arrive at a consensus as obstacles and one person identified a lack of organization in meetings.

10.4 Conclusion

The issues which need to be addressed within this caucus appear to be related to information, role clarity and co-ordination with Consortium activities.

TABLE 10.1: RESOURCE CAUCUS PROCESS VARIABLES

Item	Agree %	Uncertain %	Disagree %	No Answer %
PARTICIPATION				
4. We have many good debates and discussions on this committee.	42.9	-	-	57.1
13. I feel quite comfortable in "speaking my mind" at committee meetings.	57.1	-	-	42.9
14. I believe that my comments are respected by other members.	42.9	14.3	-	42.9
15. I believe that I make an important contribution to this committee.	28.6	28.6	-	42.9
FOCUS				
2. This committee has a hard time focusing on the issues.	14.3	28.6	14.3	42.9
3. We spend too much time discussing things that have nothing to do with the agenda.	-	-	57.1	42.9
16. We tend to deal with a lot of issues which are outside of our mandate.	28.6	-	28.6	42.9
21. This committee has a well-defined set of goals to guide its activities.	14.3	14.3	28.6	42.9
DECISION-MAKING				
6. This committee seems to have a hard time making decisions.	14.3	-	42.9	42.9
8. Committee members represent a variety of philosophical perspectives.	57.1	-	-	42.9
9. The members of this committee work well together.	42.9	14.3	-	42.9
RESOURCES				
5. Among the committee members, we have most of the skills required to do the job.	42.9	-	14.3	42.9
10. Committee material should be distributed further in advance to allow me more time to familiarize myself with it.	28.6	14.3	14.3	42.9
11. At committee meetings, we often run out of time and have to hurry through some agenda items.	-	-	57.1	42.9
12. I quite often find myself wishing that I had better information upon which to base my decisions at committee meetings.	42.9	-	14.3	42.9
18. A lack of staff resources severely limits the effectiveness of this committee.	14.3	14.3	28.6	42.9

TABLE 10.1 (cont'd)

Item	Agree %	Uncertain %	Disagree %	No Answer %
CO-ORDINATION				
19. The activities of this committee are well co-ordinated with other Employment Consortium activities.	14.3	42.9	-	42.9
20. I am well informed about overall Employment Consortium activities.	28.6	14.3	14.3	42.9
SATISFACTION				
1. This committee is dealing with important issues.	57.1	-	-	42.9
7. I usually enjoy the time I spend on this committee.	42.9	14.3	-	42.9
17. I believe that this committee makes an important contribution to the Employment Consortium.	42.9	14.3	-	42.9

TABLE 10.2: RESOURCE CAUCUS OBSTACLES

Item	% Rating Obstacle Severity as 1 or 2*	No Answer %
1. The degree of organization at committee meetings.	14.3	57.1
2. The level of participation by committee members.	-	57.1
3. Domination of committee meetings by one or two members.	-	57.1
4. Philosophical differences among the members.	-	57.1
5. A lack of clarity about the role that this committee is expected to play within the Employment Consortium.	28.6	57.1
6. The ability of the committee to arrive at a consensus about important issues.	28.6	57.1
7. The willingness of the Board to act upon committee recommendations.	-	57.1
8. The amount of support that the committee receives from the Employment Consortium.	-	57.1
9. The quality of the support that the committee receives from the Employment Consortium.	-	57.1

* 5 point scale

11.0 LABOUR CAUCUS.

The labour caucus was composed of only two members at the time of the review. For this reason, the response tables are not provided in this section of the report. It is understood that this caucus will be expanded as the need for representation from union locals develops. For questionnaire, see Appendix A, page A-17 and A-19.

There was no agreement between the two members about the extent to which they had been successful in achieving their goals.

All of the responses related to process were positive in nature and no serious obstacles were identified.

12.0 STEERING COMMITTEE

Nineteen questionnaires were distributed to members of the Steering Committee and 14 were returned for a response rate of 73.6%. For questionnaire, see Appendix A, page A-18 and A-19.

12.1 Committee Goals (Table 12.1)

The highest proportion of success ratings were recorded for the goals pertaining to identifying employers (78.6%), providing placement advice/facilitation (71.4%), identifying disabled persons (64.3%) and developing strategies for enhancing employability (57.1%).

The highest concentration of "not successful" ratings were ascribed to the goals pertaining to providing a common focus on public issues (21.4%) and mobilizing the community (21.4%).

Fifty-seven percent rated the goal of providing assistance in developing training programs as "too early to tell".

12.2 Committee Process (Table 12.2)

Responses to the items pertaining to participation were generally positive in nature although only 43% of the respondents agreed that there were many good debates and discussions within the Committee. Almost 29% disagreed with this response and 21% were uncertain.

Responses concerning Steering Committee focus were mixed. Only a minority of respondents disagreed that the Committee had a hard time focusing on issues (42.8%) or disagreed with the statement that they spent too much time discussing issues which were unrelated to the agenda (42.9%). In both of these cases, the remaining responses were divided between agreement with the statements and "uncertain". It was also notable that only 43% agreed that the committee had well-defined goals.

The results related to decision-making were also divided. Almost 36% felt that the Committee had a hard time making decisions while 42.8% disagreed with that perspective.

A number of the resource issues appeared to be problematic. Fifty-seven percent wished that Committee material could be distributed further in advance and indicated that a lack of staff resources limited

the Committee effectiveness. Fifty percent reported that the Committee often "ran out of time" in meetings and 43% indicated a need for better information for decision-making.

With respect to co-ordination, a majority of respondents felt adequately informed about Consortium activities (64.3%) although only 35.7% felt that Steering Committee activities were well co-ordinated with other Consortium activities.

Levels of satisfaction appeared to be relatively high. Seventy-nine percent agreed that the Committee made an important contribution to the Consortium and that the Committee was dealing with important issues. Seventy-one percent reported that they enjoyed the time that they spent on the Committee.

12.3 Obstacles (Table 12.3)

A lack of role clarity was most frequently mentioned as an obstacle (35.9%) followed by the organization of Steering Committee meetings (21.4%), philosophical differences among members (21.4%) and the willingness of the Steering Committee to act upon the recommendations of the caucuses (21.4%). It was notable that all of these items had a relatively high non-response rate which ranged from 21.4% to 35.7%.

12.4 Conclusions

The need for more resources to support the work of the Committee was identified as an important issue.

Issues related to the organization of meetings also appeared to be problematic. This included the distribution of materials and the need to focus discussion on items relevant to the agenda.

There were also indications that underlying problems related to group dynamics were present with respect to the Steering Committee. Sixty-four percent of the respondents indicated that the Committee members represented a variety of philosophical perspectives and almost 30% of the respondents who replied to the obstacle items indicated that this was an obstacle to better Committee performance. It was therefore notable that 28.6% disagreed with the statement - we have many good debates and discussions on this Committee. Taken together, these results suggest that there are important philosophical issues which are not being addressed within the Committee.

It is also important to note that 35.7% believed that the Committee had a hard time making decisions and only 42.8% disagreed with this perception. This problem may be a function of organization issues as well as the philosophical issues discussed previously.

The final issues identified in this problem were related to concerns about role clarity and mixed responses pertaining to Steering Committee goals. There appears to be an important need to clarify both the role and goals of the Steering Committee to foster future performance.

TABLE 12.1: STEERING COMMITTEE GOALS

	Successful %	Uncertain %	Not Successful %	Too Early To Tell %	No Answer %
A. Identify employers.	78.6	14.3	-	7.1	-
B. Identify employment needs in the community.	57.1	21.4	14.2	7.1	-
C. Identify disabled persons to fill the employment needs.	64.3	14.3	7.1	-	14.3
D. Develop strategies to enhance the employability of disabled persons.	64.3	7.1	14.2	14.3	-
E. Provide assistance in developing training programs.	21.4	-	14.3	57.1	7.1
F. Provide advice and facilitation on placement of disabled persons.	71.4	7.1	7.1	14.3	-
G. Provide a common focus on public issues of concern to disabled persons.	42.8	7.1	21.4	21.4	7.1
H. Mobilize the community to provide continuing information and leadership.	50.0	7.1	21.4	14.3	7.1

TABLE 10.2: STEERING COMMITTEE PROCESS VARIABLES

Item	Agree %	Uncertain %	Disagree %	No Answer %
PARTICIPATION				
4. We have many good debates and discussions on this committee.	42.8	21.4	28.6	7.1
13. I feel quite comfortable in "speaking my mind" at committee meetings.	85.7	-	7.1	7.1
14. I believe that my comments are respected by other members.	64.3	21.4	7.1	-
15. I believe that I make an important contribution to this committee.	78.6	14.3	-	7.1
FOCUS				
2. This committee has a hard time focusing on the issues.	28.5	21.4	42.8	7.1
3. We spend too much time discussing things that have nothing to do with the agenda.	21.4	28.6	42.9	7.1
16. We tend to deal with a lot of issues which are outside of our mandate.	14.3	14.3	58.8	7.1
21. This committee has a well-defined set of goals to guide its activities.	42.9	28.6	21.4	7.1
DECISION-MAKING				
6. This committee seems to have a hard time making decisions.	35.7	14.3	42.8	7.1
8. Committee members represent a variety of philosophical perspectives.	64.3	28.6	-	7.1
9. The members of this committee work well together.	57.2	21.4	14.2	7.1
RESOURCES				
5. Among the committee members, we have most of the skills required to do the job.	71.4	7.1	14.3	7.1
10. Committee material should be distributed further in advance to allow me more time to familiarize myself with it.	57.2	14.3	21.4	7.1
11. At committee meetings, we often run out of time and have to hurry through some agenda items.	50.0	7.1	35.7	7.1
12. I quite often find myself wishing that I had better information upon which to base my decisions at committee meetings.	42.9	7.1	42.8	7.1
18. A lack of staff resources severely limits the effectiveness of this committee.	57.2	7.1	28.6	7.1

TABLE 12.2 (cont'd)

Item	Agree %	Uncertain %	Disagree %	No Answer %
CO-ORDINATION				
19. The activities of this committee are well co-ordinated with other Employment Consortium activities.	35.7	35.7	21.4	7.1
20. I am well informed about overall Employment Consortium activities.	64.3	21.4	7.1	7.1
SATISFACTION				
1. This committee is dealing with important issues.	78.6	7.1	7.1	7.1
7. I usually enjoy the time I spend on this committee.	71.4	7.1	7.1	14.3
17. I believe that this committee makes an important contribution to the Employment Consortium.	78.6	7.1	7.1	7.1

TABLE 12.3: STEERING COMMITTEE OBSTACLES

Item	% Rating Obstacle Severity as 1 or 2*	No Answer %
1. The degree of organization at committee meetings.	21.4	21.4
2. The level of participation by committee members.	7.1	21.4
3. Domination of committee meetings by one or two members.	14.2	21.4
4. Philosophical differences among the members.	21.4	21.4
5. A lack of clarity about the role that this committee is expected to play within the Employment Consortium.	35.9	21.4
6. The ability of the committee to arrive at a consensus about important issues.	14.2	21.4
7. The willingness of the Board to act upon committee recommendations.	21.4	35.7
8. The amount of support that the committee receives from the Employment Consortium.	14.3	21.4
9. The quality of the support that the committee receives from the Employment Consortium.	7.1	28.6

* 5 point scale

PORTABILITY

13.0 PORTABILITY

To some extent, the portability analysis is limited by the fact that the Employment Consortium has only been developing for just over two years. A more detailed analysis will be possible at the end of Year 3. On the basis of the second year evaluation, however, it is possible to develop some tentative conclusions.

1. The role of the Industry-Education Council (IEC) appears to have been a critical component in the successes of the Consortium. As a "neutral" body, the IEC was able to play a sponsorship role based upon its traditional mandate as a "bridge" between the private and public sector. The history of the IEC in this role provided the Consortium with a key network which it could utilize in the formation of caucuses. In a community which lacks a similar resource, it is possible that development of the Consortium would proceed at a somewhat slower pace than occurred in the Hamilton-Wentworth project.

2. The initial recruitment of the "right" core group of employers in 1991 (Year 2) appears to be of considerable importance. The longer term recruitment of additional caucus members and placement employers appeared to be a function of the ability of the initial core group to mobilize their own networks of colleagues within the business community. The IEC was able to recruit a core of very committed and hard-working employer volunteers at a very early stage in the development of the project. As a result, the group was able to develop placement opportunities concurrent with the development of the caucus.

3. The existence of a placement agency which specialized in the assessment and placement of persons with disabilities also appeared to be an important determinant of the outcome success of the Consortium. Core resources with the appropriate skills were in place through PATH Employment Services and the willingness of this agency to second staff time to the Consortium was a key contribution to the project.

4. In carrying out a portability analysis, it is important to learn from both the successes and the problems of a pilot project. Given the results of this first evaluation, it appears that the following issues need to be addressed in other communities which are interested in developing a similar initiative:

    a) The development of concise terms of references for the caucuses, at the outset, would appear to facilitate the effective functioning of the overall process.

b) The implementation of an inter-sector information and co-ordination strategy very early in the process appears to be an important factor in forging a sense of shared identity among the individual caucuses.

c) The early development of a strong consumer caucus which mobilizes broad-based consumer input might serve as an important "bridge" or co-ordinating point for the caucuses.

d) The early development and discussion of philosophies and shared values might diminish the effects of the "culture differences" between sectors which appears to be an issue within the Hamilton-Wentworth project.

CONCLUSIONS

14.0 CONCLUSIONS

During the first two years of operation, the Employment Consortium has been successful in developing and implementing a multi-sector structure which is consistent with the original objectives of the project. At the time of the study, a total of 121 volunteers have been recruited to participate within the sector-based caucuses and the results of the member survey indicated that the vast majority of these members are satisfied with their involvement and are committed to the goals of the Consortium.

It is notable that the project was also able to focus upon the employment placement task while, at the same time, developing the multi-sector voluntary structure. According to the information provided by PATH Employment Services, a total of 32 persons with disabilities were placed in employment positions which were identified through the work of the Consortium. The vast majority of both clients and employers were satisfied with the process and the placements.

It was notable, however, that the majority of the placed clients were over the age of twenty-five and had some degree of previous employment experience (tables found on pages 6 and 8). Consequently, the ability of the Consortium to facilitate the school-to-work transition of students with disabilities was not tested in a significant way during the first year of actual placements.

Given the growing importance of the school-to-work transition issue which is resulting from the integration efforts within the educational system, it is therefore recommended that:

> **The Consortium identify a cohort of recent graduates from the secondary school system for the purpose of testing the efficacy of the Consortium program in facilitating the school-to-work transition of young persons with disabilities.**

There was also some evidence that workplace problems had not been resolved for a number of the clients (n=5). These problems appeared to be particularly difficult when they involved a conflict between the client and his/her supervisor (see table on page 12).

It is therefore recommended that the Consortium develop a more systematic response to those placements in which problems are apparent through the traditional vehicles which are available in the workplace. This systematic response could include mediation and support to both the client and supervisor.

Given the developmental and placement successes of the Consortium during its first year of operation, it now appears necessary to focus upon a number of significant "process" issues which were identified in the study. These issues are discussed in the remaining portion of this section of the report.

Identity and Co-ordination

In its initial stages of development, the Consortium does not appear to have developed an identity as a "cohesive whole". From a process perspective, there appeared to be a number of highly committed caucuses working in relative isolation. They do not feel part of a "co-ordinated whole" and feel relatively uninformed about overall Consortium activities.

With respect to outcomes, a majority of clients were not aware of the existence of the Consortium although there was a higher degree of awareness among employers (information on pages 9 and 15).

This may be a function of the developmental stage of the Consortium. It is possible that most of the process activities during the first two years were devoted to the formation of the individual caucuses and, as a result, relatively little emphasis was placed on inter-caucus co-ordination and communication.

The survey responses and the interviews suggested, however, that developmental issues were not the only factor which limited the development of the Consortium as a cohesive group. The multi-sector nature of the Consortium has resulted in the coming together of a number of different "cultures" and "perspectives" - employers, consumers, service providers, educators, labour and funders. In particular, there appears to have been an important "culture clash" between the employer caucus and service providers. These problems, in turn, have had a divisive influence upon the service providers caucus.

It is also possible that these issues are at the root of the problems related to "philosophy" within the Steering Committee. The results of the Steering Committee survey suggested that there were important but unresolved philosophical issues which were causing problems with respect to the Steering Committees' functioning (see table on page 46).

The continued existence of these issues are likely to hamper attempts to develop greater cohesion within the Consortium given the importance of shared values and philosophies in promoting group cohesion.

It is therefore important that the Consortium confront these issues in an open and honest manner with a commitment to compromise on the part of all parties.

In response to the issues identified above, the following recommendations are posed for the consideration of the Consortium:

1) **That clients be better informed about the role played by the Employment Consortium in developing employment opportunities.**
2) **That the Consortium give higher priority to the development of inter-caucus co-ordination and communications during year 3.**
3) **That the Consortium undertake a one day retreat to foster the development of a statement of shared vision, values and philosophy.**
4) **That the Consortium articulate a statement of shared vision, values and philosophy to which each member will become a signatory.**

Resources

A number of the caucuses also reported key resource problems. A lack of staff appears to represent a significant problem with respect to supporting the work of the Steering Committee and some of the caucuses (tables found on pages 22, 27, 32, 36, 39, 45).

The resource problem may also be a source of the concerns which were related to information about Consortium activities which were expressed in a number of the caucus analyses. An obvious response to this problem involves the development of frequent newsletters for all caucus members to provide for a continual updating of Consortium activities. It is also possible that an improved approach to information sharing and distribution would have a positive affect upon co-ordination and the development of a shared identity among Consortium members. The production of this type of information package, however, requires a significant investment of staff resources.

It is, therefore, recommended that the Resource Caucus address the issue of increased human resources for the Consortium. This review should involve a number of alternatives including increased funding, staff secondments and/or the use of volunteers.

Goals and Roles

Given the successes of the first two years in developing an appropriate caucus structure, it now appears to be important that concise role descriptions and statements of goals and objectives be developed for the Steering Committee and each caucus. Confusion pertaining to group role and goals was a common theme among respondents (tables found on pages 22, 26, 31, 36, 39, 45 - focus section, question #21).

It is therefore recommended that each caucus develop a concise terms of reference which clearly articulates the roles of the caucuses and specific goals for Year 3.

Support to Employers

The issue of support to employers appeared to be an important concern in both the service providers and education caucuses. Within the former group, these issues appear to have had a divisive effect on the functioning of the caucus. This does not appear to have been a divisive issue within the education caucus but the results indicated a distinct difference of opinion among the members about their effectiveness in ensuring that training resources are available to employers.

It is therefore important that representatives of these caucuses meet together to discuss expectations and response capabilities. Given the "divided opinions" which appear to exist in the service and education caucuses, however, it is unlikely that a meeting of chairpersons would resolve the issues.

It is therefore recommended that the employer caucus, service caucus and educational caucus hold a joint meeting for the purpose of identifying the key needs of employers and the appropriate response strategies by the service and education caucuses. In conducting this meeting, the Consortium should use the services of an independent facilitator.

Consumer Caucus

Given the importance of consumer participation in the work of the Consortium, it is particularly important that a strong consumer caucus play a pivotal role in project decision-making. It was notable that a number of the discussions and interviews which took place during the course of this study reflected an ongoing controversy about the extent to which the Consortium should be employer-driven or service agency-driven. The degree to which the project was consumer-driven was rarely identified as an issue except by the consumer respondents (tables and information on pages 29 - 33).

The augmentation of consumer participation within the Consortium requires a strong unified consumer caucus which is able to mobilize extensive consumer input into the process. It is therefore recommended that:

1) **The consumer caucus hold a special meeting, chaired by an independent facilitator, to discuss possible problems pertaining to conflicting or inconsistent expectations and the apparent degree of dissatisfaction among members.**
2) **The consumer caucus organize and implement a workshop for current and prospective clients to assist in the development of appropriate training and priorities for all caucuses within the Consortium.**

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES

EMPLOYMENT CONSORTIUM

Client Questionnaire

Name: _____

Date: _____

1) How did you find out about this job?

_____

_____

_____

2) Have you ever heard of the Employment Consortium program?

_____

_____

_____

Job Related Issues

1) How much are you being paid for this job? _____

2) How many days a week do you work? _____

3) How many hours a day do you work? _____

4) Can you describe to me exactly what you do when you are on the job?

_____

_____

_____

5)a) When you are at work, how do you get along with the other people who work with you? Do you:

a) talk with them? Yes ___ No ___

b) eat lunch or take breaks with them? Yes ___ No ___

c) ask them for help if you need it? Yes ___ No ___

b) Do the other people who work with you help you to do your job in any way?

_____

_____

_____

6) If you have a question or problem when you are at work, is there someone you can ask to help you?

Yes ___ No ___

(If yes) Who would that be? _____

(If no) Why not? _____

7) Have you learned any new skills at this job?

Yes ___ No ___

(If yes) What have you learned?

_____

_____

(If no) Do you think you will learn something new?

Yes ___ No ___

8) Since you started working, have your job duties changed at all?

Yes ___ No ___

(If yes) How?

_____

_____

_____

9) Have there been any problems that have come up at work that you can think of?

Yes ___ No ___

(If yes) Can you tell me what they were?

_____

_____

How did they get resolved?

_____

_____

Were you happy about how they were resolved?

Yes ___ No ___

Confidence and Self Esteem

1) a) Before your present job, did you ever go on a work placement through your school?

Yes ___ No ___

b) Before your present job, did you ever work for pay?

Yes ___ No ___

(If yes to either) What job have you had in the past?

Job	Employer	How long?	Reasons for leaving

2) Do you like the job you have?

Yes ___ No ___

Why, or why not?

3) Is there anything you can do now at work that you couldn't do when you started the job?

4) If you have learned some new things at work, how does that make you feel?

5) Since you have started working at this job, can you think of anything new you want to learn?

Yes ___ No ___

(If yes) Can you tell me what that might be?

(If no) Why not?

6) When you find you have a problem at work, how do you go about solving it?

7) If you could change anything about your job, what would it be?

_____

_____

_____

a) What is your age? _____

b) What is your gender? Male [ ] Female [ ]

c) What is your highest level of education?_____

d) What is the nature of your disability?_____

February, 1992
EC

EMPLOYMENT CONSORTIUM

Employer Questionnaire

Name: _____

Date: _____

1) How did you first find out about the Employment Consortium Project?

_____

_____

_____

2) How was the contact made?

In person ___ letter ___ phone call ___

3) Can you please describe to me in detail the process that took place from your first contact with Employment Consortium until the client was actually placed in your work place?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4) Were you satisfied with this process? Yes ___ No ___

Why, or why not?

5) If you could identify the main reason or reasons why you decided to participate in the Employment Consortium program, what would it or they be?

Expectations:

1) What do you think are the most important goals of the Employment Consortium?

2) As an employer, do you think these goals are realistic? Yes ___ No ___

Why, or why not?

3) From your experience, what are the major obstacles to employment for the handicapped adolescent when he or she leaves school?

_____

_____

_____

4) Would you say that in general, employers in the Hamilton area are ready to hire physically/mentally handicapped adolescents?

Yes ___ No ___

Why, or why not?

_____

_____

_____

Job Related Issues

1) Can you please describe the duties that _____ is performing in the work place?

_____

_____

_____

2) Are you satisfied with _____ progress to date?

Yes ___ No ___ Undecided ___

Why, or why not?

_____

_____

_____

3) Would you recommend the program to another employer?

Yes ___ No ___

Why, or why not?

_____

_____

_____

Confidence Assessment of Client

1) Have you noticed any changes in the student since he/she has started in their job?

Yes ___ No ___

(If yes) In what ways?

_____

_____

_____

2) **If you could change anything about the Employment Consortium right now, what would that change or changes be?**

_____

_____

_____

February, 1992
EC

EMPLOYER CAUCUS

1. How successful do you feel the Employer Caucus has been to date in achieving the following goals?

	Very Successful	Successful	Undecided	Not Successful	Not Very Successful	Too Early To Tell
A. To ensure that jobs are available to job seekers with disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
B. To establish a "one-stop" service centre to serve as a conduit for employers, job seekers and service providers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
C. To facilitate new ventures for self employment.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D. To support a partnership of business and disabled persons which provides advice/consultation on job accommodation to employer and disabled employees.	1	2	3	4	5	6
E. To increase training opportunities for persons with disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
F. To seek out opportunities that can lead to non-traditional job opportunities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
OTHER GOALS						
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6

SERVICE CAUCUS

1. How successful do you feel the Service Caucus ha. been to date in achieving the following goals?

	Very Successful	Successful	Undecided	Not Successful	Not Very Successful	Too Early To Tell
A. To provide a liason between service agencies and the consortium.	1	2	3	4	5	6
B. To ensure agencies are meeting the needs of consortium and employers in terms of employment supports and potential employees.	1	2	3	4	5	6
C To develop the Hotline as a source of information to consumers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
OTHER GOALS						
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6

CONSUMER CAUCUS

1. How successful do you feel the Consumer Caucus has been to date in achieving the following goals?

	Very Successful	Successful	Undecided	Not Successful	Not Very Successful	Too Early To Tell
A. Market consortium to consumers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
B. Act as an information resource to consortium.	1	2	3	4	5	6
C. Direct job seekers to the appropriate place or caucus.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D. Monitor placements in consultation with other caucuses.	1	2	3	4	5	6
E. Act as an arbiter for consumer complaints.	1	2	3	4	5	6
F. Actively seek input from the disabled community.	1	2	3	4	5	6
OTHER GOALS						
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6

EDUCATION CAUCUS

1. How successful do you feel the Education Caucus has been to date in achieving the following goals?

	Very Successful	Successful	Undecided	Not Successful	Not Very Successful	Too Early To Tell
A. To ensure that appropriate and effective training resources for the employers and employees are designed and implemented in conjuction with the needs and goals of consortium.	1	2	3	4	5	6
B. Working to improve the transition from school to work for the disabled people.	1	2	3	4	5	6

OTHER GOALS

_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6

RESOURCE CAUCUS

1. How successful do you feel the Resource Caucus has been to date in achieving the following goals?

	Very Successful	Successful	Undecided	Not Successful	Not Very Successful	Too Early To Tell
A. To provide access to and awareness of advice from all levels of government and the community to ensure the continuity and quality of the program.	1	2	3	4	5	6

OTHER GOALS

_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6

LABOUR CAUCUS

1. How successful do you feel the Service Caucus has been to date in achieving the following goals?

	Very Successful	Successful	Undecided	Not Successful	Not Very Successful	Too Early To Tell
A. To promote the consortium within the labour community.	1	2	3	4	5	6
B. To assist in breaking down (labour-related) barriers to the employment of persons with disabilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
C To provide guidance assistance to union locals, workman compensation boards on labour and legislation.	1	2	3	4	5	6

OTHER GOALS

_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6

STEERING COMMITTEE

1. How successful do you feel the Steering Committee has been to date in achieving the following goals?

	Very Successful	Successful	Undecided	Not Successful	Not Very Successful	Too Early To Tell
A. Identify employers	1	2	3	4	5	6
B. Identify employment needs in the community.	1	2	3	4	5	6
C Identify disabled persons to fill the employment needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D. Develop strategies to enhance the employability of disabled persons.	1	2	3	4	5	6
E. Provide assistance in developing training programs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
F. Provide advice and facilitation on placement of disabled persons.	1	2	3	4	5	6
G. Provide a common focus on public issues of concern to disabled persons.	1	2	3	4	5	6
H. Mobilize the community to provide continuing information and leadership.	1	2	3	4	5	6
OTHER GOALS						
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6

A. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. This committee is dealing with important issues.	1	2	3	4	5
2. This committee has a hard time focusing on the issues.	5	4	3	2	1
3. We spend too much time discussing things that have nothing to do with the agenda.	5	4	3	2	1
4. We have many good debates and discussions on this committee.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Among the committee members, we have most of the skills required to do the job.	1	2	3	4	5
6. This committee seems to have a hard time making decisions.	5	4	3	2	1
7. I usually enjoy the time that I spend on this committee.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Committee members represent a variety of philosophical perspectives.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The members of this committee work well together.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Committee material should be distributed further in advance to allow me more time to familiarize myself with it.	5	4	3	2	1

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
11. At committee meetings, we often run out of time and have to hurry through some agenda items.	5	4	3	2	1
12. I quite often find myself wishing that I had better information upon which to base my decisions at committee meetings.	5	4	3	2	1
13. I feel quite comfortable in "speaking my mind" at committee meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I believe that my comments are respected by other members.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I believe that I make an important contribution to this committee.	1	2	3	4	5
16. We tend to deal with a lot of issues which are outside of our mandate.	5	4	3	2	1
17. I believe that this committee makes an important contribution to the Employment Consortium.	1	2	3	4	5
18. A lack of staff resources severely limits the effectiveness of this committee.	5	4	3	2	1
19. The activities of this committee are well co-ordinated with other Employment Consortium activities.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20. I am well informed about overall Employment Consortium activities.	1	2	3	4	5
21. This committee has a well-defined set of goals to guide its activities.	1	2	3	4	5

Continued/.....

B. To what extend do each of the following factors serve as an obstacle to the effective performance of the committee.

	Major Obstacle		Moderate Obstacle		Not an Obstacle
1. The degree of organization at committee meetings.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The level of participation by committee members.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Domination of committee meetings by one or two members.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Philosophical differences among the members.	5	4	3	2	1
5. A lack of clarity about the role that this committee is expected to play within the Employment Consortium.	5	4	3	2	1
6. The ability of the committee to arrive at a consensus about important issues.	5	4	3	2	1
7. The willingness of the Board to act upon committee recommendations.	5	4	3	2	1
8. The amount of support that the committee receives from the Employment Consortium.	5	4	3	2	1
9. The quality of the support that the committee receives from the Employment Consortium.	5	4	3	2	1

Any comments? _____

_____

EMPLOYMENT CONSORTIUM

Steering Committee and Caucus Chairperson Interviews

1) Why do you feel it is important for the Employment Consortium to exist in the Hamilton-Wentworth community?

2) Do you believe that the Employment Consortium should work at developing a stronger identity in the Hamilton-Wentworth community?

3) What was the original purpose of forming:

a) The Employment Consortium?

b) Your Caucus?

4) What were your personal expectations of:

a) The Employment Consortium?

b) Your Caucus?

5) Have your expectations been met for:

a) The Employment Consortium?

b) Your Caucus?

6) What future direction do you feel:

a) The Employment Consortium should take?

b) Your Caucus should take?

7) Which specific Consortium needs are served by your Caucus?

8) What kind of contribution do you feel your Caucus could be making to the Consortium beyond your current activities?

9) What were the major problems encountered in the past year for:

a) The Employment Consortium?

b) Your Caucus?:

10) Were these problems solved for:

a) The Employment Consortium? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Why or why not?

b) Your Caucus Yes [ ] No [ ]

Why or why not?

11) What problems lie ahead in '92 that need to be addressed for:

a) The Employment Consortium?

b) Your Caucus?

12) When the sponsorship of the Industry Education Council ends, what kind of organizational structure would you prefer for maintaining the Consortium.

February,1992.EC